

REMARKS

Applicant has received and reviewed the final Office Action dated November 20, 2001. Claims 95-120 are pending in the application.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-23, 33-61 and 63-80 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not enabled by the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. To further the prosecution of the application, and not to acquiesce to the rejection, Applicant has submitted herewith new claims 95-119. Applicant submits new claims 95-119 are supported by the specification. No new matter has been added.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the recitation in the claims of "a method of treating prostate cancer." To make the scope of claims abundantly clear, new independent claims 95 and 112 recite "a method of alleviating or curing a prostate tumor," which is supported and defined by the specification at least at page 3, lines 15-21.

The Examiner also based the enablement rejection on the recitation in the claims of various types of enzymes. In response, Applicant strongly urges that the specification provides ample guidance for including any of the enumerated enzymes in the composition of the invention when it is locally administered, as is recited in the claims. The specification provides in detail a discussion of the substrates acted upon and the mechanisms of each type of enzyme, for example on pages 5-9. One of skill in the art would readily appreciate that local administration of any of these enzymes would lead as readily to the degradation in the tumor of structural macromolecules as does collagenase. The skilled artisan would expect the effect of administering any of these enzymes directly to a tumor to be the same as adding them to a piece of tissue or cell culture *in vitro*. Therefore, Applicant asserts that it would not require undue experimentation to utilize any of these enzymes in the solubilization and breakdown of prostate tumor tissue. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, pending claims 95-120 are in condition for allowance. Notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: Van 22, 2002

By: Mark T. Skoog
Mark T. Skoog
Reg. No. 40,178

